

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10611

man from Nebraska has had to say on this subject this afternoon. Just this morning I received in my mail a letter from a constituent who was greatly concerned about the very matter you have been discussing. His letter enclosed a clipping which refers to the fact that apparently a Member of the other body has indicated that there may be a second representative of a Communist-front organization on the staff of the super-secret Warren Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy.

I have heard some mention of this other man who has been discussed here today, but my question is: Has the gentleman from Nebraska heard anything about a second individual? Have your inquiries yielded any information on that point?

Mr. BEERMANN. I saw the newspaper article to which the gentleman refers, and that is as much as I know about it at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand the gentleman is going to continue not only his interest in this matter but in the investigation of some of the charges that have been made.

Mr. BEERMANN. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to take this opportunity publicly again to commend the gentleman for his interest in this regard.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman for his interest. His participation has emphasized the seriousness of this situation.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I know very little about the facts in connection with this man Redlich nor do I know anything about the truth of the charges that have been made. A very serious question has been raised, and I think the Members of Congress are entitled to know, as are the people of America, the background and nature of this individual who apparently is in the employ of the Warren Commission on the investigation of the assassination of our late President. In order to clarify the RECORD in regard to one of the matters brought up a few moments ago, I think the gentleman from New Hampshire wanted to know whether or not any clearance had been granted to this man by the Department of Justice, which implies the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am not in a position at this time to speak for or on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation other than to draw on my experience as a former agent many, many years ago. I would say this to the gentleman, however; the Federal Bureau of Investigation has never in the past nor do I believe at any time in the present been in the business of issuing clearances. They conduct investigations at the request of certain Government agencies and in their investigations they demonstrate they are truly a factfinding organization and whatever facts they may have dug up would, of course, be revealed to that agency of the Government

which requested the investigation. I do not believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is in the business of granting clearances.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I can reply to that comment?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I did not suggest that the FBI was in the business of granting clearances. They are an outstanding investigating agency for the Federal Government and make their report on the facts disclosed therein, which are confidential and classified and are not available for public inspection.

My point is—and I addressed my remarks to the question of whether or not a check, an investigation, had been made by the Department of Justice concerning Redlich, and if so, whether or not it had been reported to the chairman of the Commission. If such was the case, and if these were the facts, I think it was in excusable on the part of the Commission to hire a man with such a record, because just as plain as the nose at the end of your face, he is apparently thereupon a security risk.

Moreover, it is not a question of citation, of who has been cited by whom. The problem is one of loyalty to the United States of America and a basis in fact for reasonable doubts about it. Anyone who has, over a period of years, knowingly been active in Communist-dominated or heavily Communist-infiltrated organizations raises by that conduct, by that record of association a doubt about his loyalty. It is not guilt by association at all. It is a security problem. What is involved in the last analysis is dependability, reliability to America should be become involved in a showdown with the Communist bloc that can happen any day.

When a problem as serious as that of determining whether or not Communist connections existed in relation to an assassination of an American President is the issue before a factfinding commission, no person with a record of membership in an organization or active in an organization itself active on behalf of Communist causes over a period of years, should be an employee of the commission or should have access to its classified materials. The exercise of discretion to hire such an individual is incompatible with the responsibility, even the duty of objectivity, that is absolutely obligatory upon all of the members of the Commission.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me, the inquiry of the gentleman from New Hampshire is most proper and I would join him in such an inquiry that should be made to determine whether or not the Department of Justice or the FBI were requested to make an investigation and whether they in turn did report to the Commission.

Mr. BEERMANN. I believe a full field investigation has been made, and I believe it may be in the hands of the Commission. But my point is—I do not know if all its members have had time to study it—why was it even necessary when Red-

lich's ECLC affiliation was on his application?

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I have received inquiries from some of my constituents about the employment of this man. There is also the very important question whether or not the findings of this Warren Commission ultimately will be in the hands of the American public. I have made an independent inquiry concerning this matter, of certain people. I am not in a position to reveal at this time who they are, but reasonable assurances have been given that the President of the United States will receive the report of the Warren Commission in the not too distant future.

I believe it may well be during the month of June. Further, there is a suggestion that shortly thereafter, and I should presume with the permission of the President, the results will be revealed to the American public.

Now, going back to the matter about which the gentleman from Nebraska is speaking today with respect to this particular individual who has been, apparently, employed by this Commission, I also understand from some sources that this matter, too, is of concern and that perhaps some information will be revealed within the next week or two concerning who was responsible for the employment of this individual, what his actual background has been, and perhaps there will be some further action.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and appreciate his help. His broad background has contributed immeasurably to a better understanding of the subject under discussion today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any question about who is responsible for the hiring of this man. He was hired by the Commission or some member of the Commission. It has to be that way. The question is: If in ignorance they originally hired this man with the record that he has, as stated by the gentleman, why did the Commission not dispense with his services long ago? His affiliations and associations were a matter of record as the gentleman from Nebraska has stated.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and as usual his perceptiveness has come through as demonstrated by his ability to put his finger squarely on the pertinent point of our discussion.

I hope we will soon find out why the Commission has not acted in the manner he suggests.

## THE 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received the May 12 press release from the Department of Agriculture indicat-

ing the 1964 wheat program signup time was extended for 1 week.

I have no criticism of this action of the Department of Agriculture, but I surely take exception to the propaganda statement at the end of the release which I quote:

This—the new wheat program—is one-third more than he—the wheat farmer—would have received in the absence of no new legislation enacted for this year's crop.

This is purely conjecture on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The release goes on to say that the wheat price support would have been \$1.26 without new legislation. To claim that the farmers market price for wheat would have been at this level is pure speculation on the part of the Secretary. All indications are that, without new legislation, the market price for wheat would have been between \$1.55 and \$1.60, if not higher. Even officials of the Department of Agriculture admitted earlier this year the market price would have been at least \$1.35. These statements are just as accurate as the statement of the Secretary last year that wheat planted in 1964 would be more than 70 million acres. Instead, without new wheat legislation, it is anticipated the acres would be only about 54 million.

If this Congress had passed the legislation which Congressmen DOLE, SHORT, and myself have introduced, together with 17 of our colleagues, the wheat farmer would have received more income and the Secretary of Agriculture would not have the power to drive down market prices as he does under the new wheat legislation. However, what I am criticizing today is this use of USDA press releases to make purely political propaganda statements.

#### ARMED FORCES WEEK

(Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this week we honor our Armed Forces for the job they have performed in keeping this country free. We declare our pride in their valor and their strength. We rededicate ourselves to the task of keeping them second to none. But is that enough?

The planners in Washington these days, Mr. Speaker, seem to have the idea that we can be second to none only if we have the biggest and best intercontinental ballistic missiles. We are, therefore, concentrating on these nuclear missiles development at the expense of conventional and tactical weapons.

Since today's wars are not being fought with ballistic missiles, this conventional-weapons weakness of ours, developed since 1961, is a national tragedy.

All around the world today, there are "wars and rumors of wars." Cyprus is a bone of contention between Turkey and Greece. The whole Middle East is uneasy. Africa is a hotbed of revolution and counterrevolution. India is torn between Moslem and Hindu. Indonesia is threatening the new state of Malaysia.

South America is threatened by internal subversion. In none of those bubbling caldrons of warfare are ballistic missiles available.

If and when war comes, only the so-called conventional—or at the most, tactical—nuclear weapons will be used; the very weapons we are neglecting.

This is a bitter chapter in America's defense history. It is not that we are spending less. We are spending more. Our defense budget is larger than it ever was. But, as the eyes of the defense spenders are fixed on the moon, they are apparently blind to what is going on here on earth.

In Vietnam, for example, one pilot—Capt. Edwin Gerald Shank—wrote to his wife:

We are flying World War II aircraft that have seen the limit of their usefulness. We are dangerously close to returning to the days of Billy Mitchell when we were reduced to flying old crates that are not safe to fly. I believe he called it criminal negligence—the airplanes we fly are over 20 years old.

If I know our American pilots, they are getting the best out of the antiquated crates supplied to them. If I know our American mechanics, they are patching up and getting those planes to hold up to the limit. But is this not the phoniest of economies?

And what of the parents and wives of the pilots whose planes crash because a wing comes off due to metal erosion and old age?

And what sort of defense planning was it that found us woefully short of bombers when war in Cuba threatened?

I certainly support the action of the House Armed Services Committee this week in deciding to hear testimony from Defense Secretary McNamara on the use of obsolete planes in South Vietnam. Many of us on the committee are disturbed over the state of our military equipment which, if defective, endangers the lives of American servicemen.

I would recall the pleas of some of us last February in this very Chamber for restitution of a modest \$6 million for development of the COIN aircraft by the Navy. This aircraft was proposed specifically for the kind of war we are fighting—and losing—in Vietnam. It is designed for aerial reconnaissance, close support of ground troops, helicopter escort and many other light logistic tasks. Its short takeoff and landing capabilities permit its use from the unprepared fields and roads encountered in Vietnam. In addition to its combat capability, without any modifications, the aircraft can carry two litter patients and three additional passengers or upwards of 4,000 pounds of cargo.

It should again be pointed out that many millions of dollars have been invested in the design and testing of this aircraft by private firms at no cost to the Government. The limited sum of \$6 million, which can still be earmarked for this plane, would produce several aircraft for test purposes with results available in 18 months. Let me point out, too, that Convair of San Diego, which has had to lay off many employees and is virtually bereft of Government work because of the vicissitudes of Mr. McNamara's

whims, could easily undertake this assignment.

Finally, the COIN aircraft would be useful in any type of brushfire, guerrilla warfare, and is not limited in value to any single portion of the world. I would urge again that funds be made available for its development.

In this Armed Forces Week, as we salute the men and women in uniform to whom we owe so much, let us demand that our defense planners get down to earth again and plan for the conflicts that face us today—not the moon landings of some vague tomorrow. All the moon's dead craters are not worth the life of one American pilot killed by criminal negligence.

#### ECONOMIC BOYCOTT OF CUBA IS PROGRESSING

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce has altered export procedures for food and medicine sales to Cuba. This step involves shifting export of such commodities from the general licensing category to the special license classification. Prior to this action, drug manufacturers need not obtain advance permission from the Commerce Department before selling drugs to Castro. Now U.S. drug houses must await Department approval before any sale can be made.

This stiffened policy in effect clamps Castro's chances to get U.S. goods while this Nation seeks the cooperation of its allies in halting their sales to Castro. The Cuban dictator has tried to undercut us, and rigid enforcement of our export procedures will further U.S. efforts to strangle Castro's economy.

The timing of the Commerce Department move is good. Only yesterday when I spoke before the House recommending that steps be taken to investigate this matter, anti-Castro raiders had made a successful hit on the Cuban coast and Brazil announced a diplomatic break with Cuba.

As a member of the House Interstate and Commerce Committee, I feel that the Congress is entitled to a full investigation and review of any sale of drugs to Communist Cuba. Government officials and other involved parties should be given the opportunity to clarify and assure the American people that this Nation will take all steps necessary to topple Communist Cuba.

#### HENRY J. KAISER OF HAWAII

(Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Joint Resolution 1021, a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 1020, which would authorize the expression of appreciation of the Congress of the United States by the

1964

man from Nebraska has had to say on this subject this afternoon. Just this morning I received in my mail a letter from a constituent who was greatly concerned about the very matter you have been discussing. His letter enclosed a clipping which refers to the fact that apparently a Member of the other body has indicated that there may be a second representative of a Communist-front organization on the staff of the super-secret Warren Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy.

I have heard some mention of this other man who has been discussed here today, but my question is: Has the gentleman from Nebraska heard anything about a second individual? Have your inquiries yielded any information on that point?

Mr. BEERMANN. I saw the newspaper article to which the gentleman refers, and that is as much as I know about it at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand the gentleman is going to continue not only his interest in this matter but in the investigation of some of the charges that have been made.

Mr. BEERMANN. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to take this opportunity publicly again to commend the gentleman for his interest in this regard.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman for his interest. His participation has emphasized the seriousness of this situation.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I know very little about the facts in connection with this man Redlich nor do I know anything about the truth of the charges that have been made. A very serious question has been raised, and I think the Members of Congress are entitled to know, as are the people of America, the background and nature of this individual who apparently is in the employ of the Warren Commission on the investigation of the assassination of our late President. In order to clarify the Record in regard to one of the matters brought up a few moments ago, I think the gentleman from New Hampshire wanted to know whether or not any clearance had been granted to this man by the Department of Justice, which implies the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am not in a position at this time to speak for or on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation other than to draw on my experience as a former agent many, many years ago. I would say this to the gentleman, however; the Federal Bureau of Investigation has never in the past nor do I believe at any time in the present been in the business of issuing clearances. They conduct investigations at the request of certain Government agencies and in their investigations they demonstrate they are truly a factfinding organization and whatever facts they may have dug up would, of course, be revealed to that agency of the Government

which requested the investigation. I do not believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is in the business of granting clearances.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I can reply to that comment?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I did not suggest that the FBI was in the business of granting clearances. They are an outstanding investigating agency for the Federal Government and make their report on the facts disclosed therein, which are confidential and classified and are not available for public inspection.

My point is—and I addressed my remarks to the question of whether or not a check, an investigation, had been made by the Department of Justice concerning Redlich, and if so, whether or not it had been reported to the chairman of the Commission. If such was the case, and if these were the facts, I think it was in excusable on the part of the Commission to hire a man with such a record, because just as plain as the nose at the end of your face, he is apparently thereupon a security risk.

Moreover, it is not a question of citation, of who has been cited by whom. The problem is one of loyalty to the United States of America and a basis in fact for reasonable doubts about it. Anyone who has, over a period of years, knowingly been active in Communist-dominated or heavily Communist-infiltrated organizations raises by that conduct, by that record of association a doubt about his loyalty. It is not guilt by association at all. It is a security problem. What is involved in the last analysis is dependability, reliability to America should be become involved in a showdown with the Communist bloc that can happen any day.

When a problem as serious as that of determining whether or not Communist connections existed in relation to an assassination of an American President is the issue before a factfinding commission, no person with a record of membership in an organization or active in an organization itself active on behalf of Communist causes over a period of years, should be an employee of the commission or should have access to its classified materials. The exercise of discretion to hire such an individual is incompatible with the responsibility, even the duty of objectivity, that is absolutely obligatory upon all of the members of the Commission.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me, the inquiry of the gentleman from New Hampshire is most proper and I would join him in such an inquiry that should be made to determine whether or not the Department of Justice or the FBI were requested to make an investigation and whether they in turn did report to the Commission.

Mr. BEERMANN. I believe a full field investigation has been made, and I believe it may be in the hands of the Commission. But my point is—I do not know if all its members have had time to study it—why was it even necessary when Red-

lich's ECLC affiliation was on his application?

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I have received inquiries from some of my constituents about the employment of this man. There is also the very important question whether or not the findings of this Warren Commission ultimately will be in the hands of the American public. I have made an independent inquiry concerning this matter, of certain people. I am not in a position to reveal at this time who they are, but reasonable assurances have been given that the President of the United States will receive the report of the Warren Commission in the not too distant future.

I believe it may well be during the month of June. Further, there is a suggestion that shortly thereafter, and I should presume with the permission of the President, the results will be revealed to the American public.

Now, going back to the matter about which the gentleman from Nebraska is speaking today with respect to this particular individual who has been, apparently, employed by this Commission, I also understand from some sources that this matter, too, is of concern and that perhaps some information will be revealed within the next week or two concerning who was responsible for the employment of this individual, what his actual background has been, and perhaps there will be some further action.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and appreciate his help. His broad background has contributed immeasurably to a better understanding of the subject under discussion today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any question about who is responsible for the hiring of this man. He was hired by the Commission or some member of the Commission. It has to be that way. The question is: If in ignorance they originally hired this man with the record that he has, as stated by the gentleman, why did the Commission not dispense with his services long ago? His affiliations and associations were a matter of record as the gentleman from Nebraska has stated.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and as usual his perceptiveness has come through as demonstrated by his ability to put his finger squarely on the pertinent point of our discussion.

I hope we will soon find out why the Commission has not acted in the manner he suggests.

#### THE 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received the May 12 press release from the Department of Agriculture indicat-